

REMARKS

This Amendment, filed in reply to the Office Action dated April 2, 2008, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

I. Summary of Final Office Action

Claims 1-10 are all the claims pending in the application.

Claims 1-5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bichot et al. (US Pub. 2004/0001468; hereinafter “Bichot”) in view of Chuah (US Pub. US 2003/0076803; hereinafter “Chuah”).

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bichot in view of Chuah and Soderbacka et al. (US Pub. US 2003/0114158; hereinafter “Soderbacka”).

Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Chuah in view of Bichot.

Claims 8, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Chuah in view of Bichot as applied to claim 6, and Soderbacka.

II. Amendment Summary

In this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1, 2, 6 and 10 by correcting minor informalities, and adds new claims 11-20 to more fully cover the present application. No new matter is added. New claims are discussed later in detail

III. Analysis of § 103 Claim Rejection

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner, *inter alia*, alleges that the fourth component of the claimed interface unit for providing data indicative of a load situation of a logical cell is taught by Chuah.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Chuah is directed to a reconfigurable radio access network architecture that enables a Node B to get connected to different radio network controllers (RNCs) in a Universal Mobile Telecommunication Network (UMTS). The most noticeable feature of Chuah is that one Node B is permitted to switch between different RNCs (paragraph [0027], line 2-3 of Chuah). This coupling to different RNCs is subject to resource availability information for each RNC (paragraph [0021], lines 4-5). That is, Chuah discloses an RNC assignment system (not a Node B assignment system). Assuming that this network architecture applies to a wireless local area network (WLAN), Chuah may also be alleged to disclose a mobile agent (MA) assignment system in which one access point (AP) is permitted to switch different MAs (Fig. 6).

It is noted, however, that Chuah does not disclose load balancing between Node Bs or APs, or load balancing of a group of Node Bs or APs. This reference only concerns about load balancing between RNCs or MAs for assigning each RNC or MA to a respective Node B or AP based on resource availability information on each RNC or MA (paragraph [0027], line 2-3). By contrast, the fourth component of the claimed interface unit is configured to provide data indicative of a load situation of a logical cell to an RNC coupled to the interface unit. That is, while the fourth component refers to load balancing information on a logical cell, Chuah refers to the load balancing of RNCs or MAs. Here, the logical cell of the claim is constituted by plural physical cells, and corresponds to a group of plural Node Bs or APs¹. Paragraph [0020] of Chuah cited by the Examiner (page 4, line 4 of the office action) describes only a traffic load or resource availability for an RNC or MA, but not for a logical cell which may correspond to a group of plural Node Bs or APs². Chuah also does not mention anywhere in the disclosure a total load of plural Node Bs or APs within a logical cell.

¹ This is also admitted by the Examiner citing Fig. 4 of Chuah and paragraph [0024], lines 8-9 where the routers R1 and R2 are alleged to correspond to logical cells. See page 4, lines 1-2 of the office action of April 2, 2008.

² An RNC and a Node B are referred to as a base station controller and a base station, respectively, in paragraph [0019], lines 8-11 of Chuah.

At least because the fourth component of the claimed interface unit is not taught by Chuah as discussed above, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 1. At least for the same reason, claims 6 and 10 that contain the same feature of the further component of claim 1 would not have been obvious in view of Bichot and Chuah.

Claims 2-3 and 7-9 should be allowable at least due to their dependencies in addition to their additionally recited elements.

With respect to claim 4, the Examiner cites paragraph [0030], lines 1-3 of Chuah to allege that this reference teaches the fifth component configured to balance a total load of the plurality of APs. Paragraph [0030] describes load distribution among different RNCs and Node Bs. Here, the Examiner appears to read only “load distribution among different Node Bs”. This part of disclosure should read, however, such that each of plural Node Bs is permitted to switch between different RNCs, but should not read such that one RNC is permitted to switch between different Node Bs depending on a total load of plural Node Bs constituting a logical cell. The remaining part of the same paragraph as well as all other paragraphs of discloses load distribution only between different RNCs or MAs but not between Node Bs or APs, or a logical cell comprising plural Node Bs or APs.

Thus, claim 4 should be allowable without regard to its dependency.

Claim 5 should also be allowable at least due to its dependency on top of its additionally recited elements.

IV. New Claims

New claims 11-13 are supported at least in page 10, lines 12-18 and page 13, lines 9-22 of the specification (paragraphs [0038]-[0040] and paragraphs [0052]-[0055] of US2004/0076179 for the present application). The subject matter of these claims are not taught or suggested by the references cited by the Examiner.

New claims 14 and 18 are supported at least in Figs. 1-5; page 5, lines 9-12; page 7, lines 11-14; and page 8, 13-16 of the specification (paragraphs [0016], [0028] and [0032] of

US2004/0076179 of the present application). These claims are distinguished from Bichot at least under the following reason.

As the interface unit of the present application mimics a node (e.g. Node B) of a first network even though it is connected to plural APs in a second network, it is directly coupled to an RNC not by way of any node served in the first network and coupled to the RNC. By contrast, the interworking unit (IWU) 18 of Bichot is connected to the RNC of the 3GPP network 12 by way of the node 21 served in the 3GPP network 12 and coupled to the RNC.

New claims 15 and 19 are supported also at least in Figs. 1-5; page 5, lines 9-12; page 7, lines 11-14; and page 8, 13-16 of the specification (paragraphs [0016], [0028] and [0032] of US2004/0076179 of the present application). The 3GPP network is regarded as serving mobile terminals through a Node B, and the node 21 of Bichot (Fig. 1) is a Node B which is a base station that serves mobile terminals located in the 3GPP network 12. Thus, the IWU 18 that is connected to the RNC of the 3GPP network 12 does not teach the claimed interface unit that is directly connected to the RNC not by way of a Node B. Thus, these claims further distinguish the present application from the references including Bichot.

New claims 16 and 20 are supported at least in Figs. 1, 2, 5 and page 8, lines 10-16 (paragraphs [0032] of US2004/0076179 for the present application). The claimed subject matter of these claims are also not taught or suggested by the references.

New claim 17 corresponds to claim 10, and should be distinguished for the same reason for the patentability of claim 10.

The new claims do not contain new matter.

Applicant respectfully requests entrance and allowance of the new claims.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Seunghee Park
Registration No. 60,719

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 2, 2008